arXiv:1511.05637v1 [math.PR] 18 Nov 2015

Discrete one-dimensional oriented percolation of intervals

Sandro Gallo
Departamento de Estatísitca
Universidade Federal de São Carlos
and
Nancy L. Garcia
IMECC
Universidade Estadual de Campinas

Abstract

We consider the following oriented percolation model in $\mathbb{N}$. For each site $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we associate a pair (ξ_i, R_i) where $\{\xi_0, \xi_1, \ldots\}$ is a 1-dimensional undelayed discrete renewal point process and $\{R_0, R_1, \ldots\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of $\mathbb{N}$-valued random variables. At each site where $\xi_i = 1$ we start an interval of length R_i. Percolation occurs if every sites of $\mathbb{N}$ is covered by some interval. We obtain sharp conditions for both, positive and null probability of percolation. As corollaries, we extend results of the literature of rumor processes and discrete one-dimensional boolean percolation.

1 Introduction

Consider two independent sequences of random variables, $(\xi_i)_{i\geq 0}$ a sequence of Bernoulli random variables and $(R_i)_{i\geq 0}$ a sequence of i.i.d. copies of some $\mathbb{N}$-valued random variable R. For each site $i \in \mathbb{N}$ associate the pair (ξ_i, R_i), and whenever $\xi_i = 1$, start to the right an interval of length R_i. Percolation occurs if every site of $\mathbb{N}$ is covered by some interval. Naturally, the probability of percolation depends on both, the marginal distribution of R, and the joint distribution of the ξ_i's. If the ξ_i's are independent, this is a discrete one-dimensional Boolean percolation model, and the *if and only if* condition for positive probability of percolation is known (see for example, Bertacchi and Zucca (2013) and Gallo, Garcia, Junior and Rodríguez (2014)). For the Markov case, Athreya, Roy and Sarkar (2004) obtained sharp conditions for both, positive and null probability of percolation. In the present paper, under assumptions that the chain $(\xi_i)_{i\geq 0}$ renews often enough, we extend their results to the case where it is an undelayed renewal sequence, that is, a stochastic chain with $\xi_0 = 1$ and such that each occurrence of a 1 is a renewal event. This is an extension of the previous works since a binary Markov chain renews at each occurrence of a 1 according to the strong Markov property, but a renewal sequence needs not to be Markovian.

In Junior, Machado and Zuluaga (2011), Bertacchi and Zucca (2013), and Gallo et al. (2014), the one-dimensional discrete Boolean percolation model is referred as *firework process*, and an interpretation in terms of information propagation is given. These works also analyse another closely related model, called *reverse firework process*, which is nothing more than the *dual* of the firework process (borrowing the terminology of contact process). It turns out that this "dual" picture survives even in the more complicated situation where the process $(\xi_i)_{i\geq 0}$ is not a sequence of independent r.v.'s, but follows a reversible law.

In the present paper, since the renewal sequence $(\xi_i)_{i\geq 0}$ follows a reversible law, our strategy is to study the dual process to infer properties of the original percolation model. A

consequence of this approach it that several results concerning what would be the "renewal reverse firework process" are obtained as a step toward our proofs.

We prove that this dual process is also an undelayed renewal process, with an inter-arrival distribution that depends on the distribution of R and of the renewal sequence $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. This result allows to obtain, as an application of the Renewal Theorem, a closed formula giving the exact probability of percolation. Informally, we could say that this formula is expressed in terms of the generating function of arbitrarily large vectors of the renewal process $(\xi_i)_{i\geq 0}$. With this in hand, explicit conditions for null and positive probability of percolation will be obtained.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we introduce the model and state the results. The proofs are given in Section 3, together with some results concerning the reverse renewal firework process. We conclude the paper with Section 4 where we discuss the results with respect to related interpretations of the model.

2 Model and results

2.1 The model

In order to introduce the percolation model of the present paper, we first define the renewal chain $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. A convenient way to introduce this stochastic chain is by considering first the $\mathbb{N}$-valued Markov chain, known in the literature as *house-of-cards*, $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\zeta_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ starting from 0 at site 0 and having transition matrix

$$Q(i,j) = (1-q_i)\mathbf{1}\{j=0\} + q_i\mathbf{1}\{j=i+1\},\ i\geq 0.$$

It is well-known that $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ converges to a stationary regime if and only if $\sum_{n\geq 1}\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} q_i < \infty$. The chain $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is now defined through

$$\xi_i = \mathbf{1}\{\zeta_i = 0\},\ i\geq 0.$$

This new chain is a discrete renewal sequence (undelayed since it starts with a 1) because the times separating consecutive 1's are i.i.d. and therefore the chain renews at each visit to a one. These times, called inter-arrival times, are copies of a r.v. that we call T, which has distribution

$$\mathbb{P}(T=n) = (1-q_{n-1})\prod_{i=0}^{n-2} q_i,\ n\geq 1$$

and expectation

$$\mathbb{E}T = \sum_{n\geq 1}\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} q_i. \tag{1}$$

Now, let $\{R_i,\ i\geq 0\}$, be a sequence of independent copies of some $\mathbb{N}$-valued r.v. R independent of the sequence $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. Let

$$\alpha_n := \mathbb{P}(R\leq n), n\geq 0. \tag{2}$$

Consider the sequence C_i, $i\geq 0$ of random intervals defined as $C_i := [i+1, i+R_i]$ if $\xi_i = 1$ and $C_i = \emptyset$ if $\xi_i = 0$ or $R_i = 0$. For any $i,j\geq 0$, declare i and j connected, and write $i\leftrightarrow j$, if $\xi_i = \xi_j = 1$ and there exist $m\leq n < j$ such that $\{i,\ldots,j\}\subset \cup_{l=m}^{n} C_l$. The percolation event is

$$\mathcal{A} = \cap_{i\geq 1}\cup_{j\geq i}\{0\leftrightarrow j\}.$$

Notation alert 2.1. *We will denote by $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{E}$ the probability measure and expectation with respect to the joint law of the sequences $(\xi_i)_{i\geq 0}$ and $(R_i)_{i\geq 0}$ conditioned on $\xi_0 = 1$.*

We begin with the following very simple fact.

Proposition 1. *If* $\mathbb{E}T = \infty$ *(that is, if* $\sum_{n\geq 1}\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} q_i = \infty$*), then* $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) = 0$.

So, owing to Proposition 1, the case where $\mathbb{E}T = \infty$ is not interesting for this model. Unless explicitly mentioned, we will always assume $\mathbb{E}T < \infty$ in the remaining of this paper.

Our first main result is a closed formula for the probability of percolation.

Theorem 1. $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) = \left(1 + \sum_{n\geq 1}\mathbb{E}\prod_{i=0}^{n-1}\alpha_i^{\xi_{i+1}}\right)^{-1}$.

Observe that the quantity

$$\mathbb{E}\prod_{i=0}^{n-1}\alpha_i^{\xi_{i+1}} = \sum_{(x_1,\ldots,x_n)\in\{0,1\}^n}\alpha_0^{x_1}\ldots\alpha_{n-1}^{x_n}\mathbb{P}(\xi_1 = x_1,\ldots,\xi_n = x_n)$$

is the probability generating function of the binary vector $(\xi_1,\ldots,\xi_n)$ at $(\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{n-1})$, under measure $\mathbb{P}$ (which is, we recall, conditioned on having $\xi_0 = 1$). There exist some results in the literature giving more explicit expressions of this quantity (see, for example, Lemma 1 in Kolev, Kolkovska and López-Mimbela (2006)) which are nevertheless difficult to handle. Obviously, when $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is an i.i.d. sequence, we use independence to factorize $\mathbb{E}\prod_{i=0}^{n-1}\alpha_i^{\xi_{i+1}}$, and we get the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *If* $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ *is an i.i.d. sequence with* $\mathbb{P}(\xi_i = 1) \equiv p$*, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) = \left(1 + \sum_{n\geq 1}\prod_{i=0}^{n-1}[1 - p(1-\alpha_i)]\right)^{-1}.$$

This is one of the results that was obtained by Gallo et al. (2014). In the general case however, the exact same result may not hold. We postpone to Section 4 the discussion concerning possible upper and lower bounds for $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})$ in the general non independent case.

Our next results give explicit sufficient conditions for having null or positive probability of percolation.

For null probability, the following result holds without any further assumptions.

Proposition 2. *If* $\limsup_{n\to\infty} n(\mathbb{E}T)^{-1}(1-\alpha_n) < 1$*, then* $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) = 0$.

To guarantee positive probability of percolation, we will need an extra assumption concerning $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. Let us introduce the notation

$$q_i^* := \max_{n\leq i} q_n,\ i \geq 0. \tag{3}$$

Proposition 3. *If*

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k}\prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1} q_i^*\right)^2 = O(k), \tag{4}$$

and $\liminf_{n\to\infty} n(\mathbb{E}T)^{-1}(1-\alpha_n) > 1$*, then* $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) > 0$.

Observe that for renewal processes satisfying (4), Propositions 2 and 3 yield a tight phase transition between null and positive probability of percolation. We will show in Section 4 that two particular cases of interest satisfying condition (4) are:

(i) *The Doeblin assumption:* $q_i \leq 1 - \epsilon$ for $i \geq 0$. As a particular case of the Doeblin assumption, suppose $q_i = q_1$ for any $i \geq 1$, with q_0, $q_1 \in (0,1)$. Then $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is the positive recurrent Markov chain with transition matrix $P(1|1) = 1 - q_0$ and $P(1|0) = 1 - q_1$ and we recover the results obtained by Athreya et al. (2004).

(ii) *The monotonicity assumption:* $\{q_i, i \geq 0\}$ is non-decreasing. For example, $q_i = 1 - \frac{1}{i^\beta}$, $i \geq 2$ with $0 < \beta < 1/2$ satisfies condition (4).

In Section 4 we will also present other new results, comparisons with the literature, and explicit examples.

3 Proofs of the results

When $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is i.i.d., the percolation model described in Section 2 is basically the rumor process, called Firework Process (FP), studied by Junior et al. (2011) and Gallo et al. (2014) among others. These works were also interested into another rumor process called Reverse Firework Process (RFP) which, as observed in Gallo et al. (2014) (Section 5, Item (1)), bears a strong relationship with the FP. Here, we will show that, if $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is an undelayed renewal process, the RFP is nothing more that then *dual* of the FP, and this in fact is true as long as $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ has a reversible law. It turns out that this dual process is easier to analyse than the original percolation model and provides explicit bounds for the probability of percolation.

The present section is organised as follows. In Section 3.1 we introduce and analyse a *dual process*, in Section 3.2 we prove the Duality Lemma (Lemma 1) and in Section 3.3 we prove Theorem 1 and Propositions 2 and 3.

3.1 The dual process

It is more suitable for our purposes to describe the dual process as an information (or rumor) propagation process. Associate to each site $i \geq 0$ an independent copy R_i of R, and denote by $\mathcal{S} := \{i \geq 0 : \xi_i = 1\}$. At step 0, there is one individual at site 0 and it is informed. Thus $B_0 := \{0\}$ denotes the set of individuals informed at step 0. At step $n \geq 1$, the newly informed individuals are those at sites $i \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\{i - R_i, \ldots, i-1\} \cap B_{n-1} \neq \emptyset$. Thus, the set of individuals that are informed at step n is

$$B_n := \{i \in \mathcal{S} : \ \{i - R_i, \ldots, i-1\} \cap B_{n-1} \neq \emptyset\} \setminus \cup_{j=0}^{n-1} B_j.$$

Pictorially, an informed individual transmits the information to the individuals on its right having a radius that covers him (and which therefore listen to him).

Let $\mathbf{Y}^{(0)} = (1, 0, 0, \ldots)$ and for any $i \geq 1$, let $\mathbf{Y}^{(i)}$ the sequence of $\{0,1\}$-valued r.v.'s such that $Y_i^{(n)} = 1$ if and only if $i \in \cup_{j=0}^{n} B_j$, that is, site i received the information at step n or earlier. By monotonicity ($Y_i^{(n)} = 1 \Rightarrow Y_i^{(m)} = 1$ for any $m \geq n$), the sequence of processes $(\mathbf{Y}^{(n)})_{n \geq 0}$ converges to some process $\mathbf{Y}$ which takes value 1 at site i if, and only if, this site has been informed at some step in the information propagation.

Proposition 4. $\mathbf{Y}$ *is an undelayed renewal sequence with inter-arrival time* $T_{\mathbf{Y}}$ *has distribution given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbf{Y}} = 1) &= (1 - q_0)(1 - \alpha_0), \\ \mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbf{Y}} = k) &= \mathbb{E}(1 - \alpha_{k-1}^{\xi_k}) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_{i-1}^{\xi_i}, \ k \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 4. The process $\mathbf{Y}$ does not retain the information of the localization of all the individuals on $\mathbb{N}$, and only gives the information of the localization of the *informed* individuals. So we introduce the process $\mathbf{X}$ that keeps all the information, by adding a symbol as follows, for any $n \geq 0$

$$X_n = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if there is nobody at site } n; \\ 1, & \text{if there is a non informed individual at site } n; \\ 2, & \text{if there is an informed individual at site } n. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Thus, we have $Y_n = \mathbf{1}\{X_n = 2\}$ for any $n \geq 0$.

Now, for any sequence $a_0^n = (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \{2\} \times \{0,1,2\}^n$, $0 \leq n < +\infty$, we define

$$\ell_2(a_0^n) := \inf\{i \geq 0 : \, a_{n-i} = 2\}$$

which is the number of symbols since the last occurrence of 2 in a_0^n. Notice that, since we consider only sequences that begins with $a_0 = 2$, then $\ell_2(a_0^n) \leq n$. For any $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\{X_n = 2\} = \{\xi_n = 1\} \cap \{R_n \geq \ell_2(X_0^{n-1})\}. \tag{6}$$

Therefore, using independence between the radii and the process $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, for any $a_0^{n-1} \in \{2\} \times \{0,1,2\}^{n-1}$ we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n = 2 | X_0^{n-1} = a_0^{n-1}) = \mathbb{P}\left(\xi_n = 1 | \xi_i = \mathbf{1}\{a_i > 1\},\, i = 0, \ldots, n-1\right) \mathbb{P}(R_n \geq \ell_2(a_0^{n-1})).$$

The information we extract from this equality is that the conditional probabilities of X_n given its past X_0^{n-1} only depends on this past since the last occurrence of a 2. In other words, the limiting process $\mathbf{Y}$ is an undelayed renewal sequence with inter-arrival time $T_{\mathbf{Y}}$ satisfying

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbf{Y}} \geq k) = \sum_{a_1^{k-1} \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}} \mathbb{P}\left(X_1^{k-1} = a_1^{k-1} | X_0 = 2\right), \text{ for } k \geq 2. \tag{7}$$

Observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbf{Y}} = 1) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 = 2 | X_0 = 2) = \mathbb{P}(R_1 \geq 1, \xi_1 = 1 | \xi_0 = 1),$$

and using independence, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbf{Y}} = 1) = \mathbb{P}(R_1 \geq 1)\mathbb{P}(\xi_1 = 1 | \xi_0 = 1) = (1 - q_0)(1 - \alpha_0).$$

To prove the second part of the theorem, it only remains to compute $\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbf{Y}} \geq k)$ for $k \geq 2$. For any $a_1^{k-1} \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}$,

$$\{X_1^{k-1} = a_1^{k-1}\} = \{\xi_1^{n-1} = a_1^{n-1}\} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^{k-1} \{R_i < i.\mathbf{1}\{a_i = 1\} + \infty.\mathbf{1}\{a_i = 0\}\},$$

meaning that, at each site $i \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ such that $\xi_i = 1$, we have $R_i < i$ (the symbol ∞ above means that if $\xi_i = 0$, the value of R_i does not matter). Thus, using independence

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{\mathbf{Y}} \geq k) = \sum_{a_1^{k-1} \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}} \mathbb{P}(\xi_1^{k-1} = a_1^{k-1} | \xi_0 = 1) \alpha_0^{a_1} \ldots \alpha_{k-2}^{a_{k-1}} = \mathbb{E} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_{i-1}^{\xi_i}.$$

□

3.2 Duality

The following lemma states that $\mathbf{Y}$ is the dual of our original percolation model. We will see that this is only due to the reversibility of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$.

Lemma 1.

$$\mathbb{P}(0 \leftrightarrow n) = \mathbb{P}(Y_n = 1).$$

Proof. Consider the event {percolation reaches site n}, that is, $\{0 \leftrightarrow n\}$.
Revert the names of the sites, that is, switch 0 to n and n to 0. The event $\{0 \leftrightarrow n\}$ now reads {site n receives the information of 0}, that is $\{Y_n = 1\}$. The fact that the probabilities are equal follows from the reversibility of the undelayed renewal process $\boldsymbol{\xi}$.

Explicitely, observe that

$$\mathbb{P}(0 \leftrightarrow n) = \mathbb{P}(R_0 \geq n, \xi_n = 1) + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \sum_{\substack{(i_1,\dots,i_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m \\ 0 < i_1 < \dots < i_m < n}} \mathcal{A}(i_1, \dots, i_m) \tag{8}$$

where, if we use the convention that $i_{m+1} = n$, $\mathcal{A}(i_1, \dots, i_m)$ is defined as

$$\mathbb{P}(i_1 \leq R_0 < n,\, \xi_{i_k} = 1,\, R_{i_k} \geq i_{k+1} - i_k \,, k = 1, \dots, m,\, \xi_n = 1). \tag{9}$$

In words, these formulae say the following. Site 0 is connected to n if, and only if, $\xi_n = 1$ and either site 0 has radius larger than n, or there exists a sequence of marks of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ (the vector $(i_1, \dots, i_m)$), each having radius allowing to reach the next one, from 0 to n.

Owing to the independence between the radii and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, $\mathcal{A}(i_1, \dots, i_m)$ rewrites as

$$\mathbb{P}(i_1 \leq R_0 < n,\, R_{i_k} \geq i_{k+1} - i_k \,, k = 1, \dots, m)\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_k} = 1,\, k = 1, \dots, m,\, \xi_n = 1).$$

Now, calculating the same, for the dual process based on $\bar{R}_i, i \geq 1$, independent copies of R_0, (we use bars for distinction) and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ having the same distribution as $\boldsymbol{\xi}$

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_n = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\bar{R}_n \geq n) + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \sum_{\substack{(\bar{i}_1,\dots,\bar{i}_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m \\ 0 < \bar{i}_m < \dots < \bar{i}_1 < n}} \bar{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{i}_1, \dots, \bar{i}_m)$$

where, using the convention that $\bar{i}_{m+1} = 0$, $\bar{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{i}_1, \dots, \bar{i}_m)$ is defined as

$$\mathbb{P}(n - \bar{i}_1 \leq \bar{R}_n < n,\, \bar{\xi}_{\bar{i}_k} = 1,\, \bar{R}_{\bar{i}_k} \geq \bar{i}_k - \bar{i}_{k+1} \,, k = 1, \dots, m,\, \bar{\xi}_n = 1).$$

Observe that, for simplicity of a future correspondence we want to exhibit, we enumerated the index backwards, that is $\bar{i}_k \geq \bar{i}_{k+1}$.

Here also, by the independence between the radii and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$, $\bar{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{i}_1, \dots, \bar{i}_m)$ rewrites as

$$\mathbb{P}(n - \bar{i}_1 \leq \bar{R}_n < n,\, \bar{R}_{\bar{i}_k} \geq \bar{i}_k - \bar{i}_{k+1},\, k = 1, \dots, m)\mathbb{P}(\bar{\xi}_{\bar{i}_k} = 1,\, k = 1, \dots, m,\, \bar{\xi}_n = 1).$$

Now, to see that $\mathbb{P}(0 \leftrightarrow n) = \mathbb{P}(Y_n = 1)$, we make the correspondence $\bar{i}_k = n - i_k$ for any k, and $\bar{R}_i = R_{n-i}$ for any i, which in particular yields $\bar{R}_{\bar{i}_k} = R_{i_k}$. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(n - \bar{i}_1 \leq \bar{R}_n < n,\, \bar{R}_{\bar{i}_k} \geq \bar{i}_k - \bar{i}_{k+1},\, k = 1, \dots, m) =$$

$$\mathbb{P}(i_1 \leq R_0 < n,\, R_{i_k} \geq i_{k+1} - i_k,\, k = 1, \dots, m)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{\xi}_{\bar{i}_k} = 1,\, k = 1, \dots, m,\, \bar{\xi}_n = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\bar{\xi}_{n-i_k} = 1,\, k = 1, \dots, m,\, \bar{\xi}_n = 1).$$

Since $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ has the same distribution as $\boldsymbol{\xi}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{\xi}_{n-i_k} = 1,\, k = 1, \dots, m,\, \bar{\xi}_n = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{n-i_k} = 1,\, k = 1, \dots, m,\, \xi_n = 1).$$

But $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ satisfies a reversibility property. To explain it, we will exceptionally explicit the conditioning on $\xi_0 = 1$, for the argument to get more transparent. We have, by the renewal property,

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_{n-i_m} = 1, \xi_{n-i_{m-1}} = 1, \dots, \xi_{n-i_1} = 1, \xi_n = 1 | \xi_0 = 1) =$$

$\mathbb{P}(\xi_{n-i_m}=1|\xi_0=1)\mathbb{P}(\xi_{n-i_{m-1}}=1|\xi_{n-i_m}=1)\dots\mathbb{P}(\xi_{n-i_1}=1|\xi_{n-i_2}=1)\mathbb{P}(\xi_n=1|\xi_{n-i_1}=1)$.
Now, by homogeneity, this later quantity equals

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_{n-i_m}=1|\xi_0=1)\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_m-i_{m-1}}=1|\xi_0=1)\dots\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_2-i_1}=1|\xi_0=1)\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_1}=1|\xi_0=1).$$

Reordering, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_1}=1|\xi_0=1)\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_2-i_1}=1|\xi_0=1)\dots\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_m-i_{m-1}}=1|\xi_0=1)\mathbb{P}(\xi_{n-i_m}=1|\xi_0=1).$$

Using one more time the homogeneity, we get

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_1}=1|\xi_0=1)\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_2}=1|\xi_{i_1}=1)\dots\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_m}=1|\xi_{i_{m-1}}=1)\mathbb{P}(\xi_n=1|\xi_{i_m}=1)$$

which, by the renewal property, equals

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_1}=1,\,\xi_{i_2}=1,\dots,\,\xi_{i_m}=1,\,\xi_n=1|\xi_0=1).$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_{n-i_k}=1,\,k=1,\dots,m,\,\xi_n=1)=\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i_k}=1,\,k=1,\dots,m,\,\xi_n=1).$$

We conclude that

$$\bar{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{i}_1,\dots,\bar{i}_m)=\mathcal{A}(i_1,\dots,i_m)$$

which proves the lemma. □

3.3 Proofs of the results

Proof of Theorem 1. By definition $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})=\limsup_n\mathbb{P}(0\leftrightarrow n)$ and by Lemma 1 $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})=\limsup_n\mathbb{P}(Y_n=1)$. But since, by Theorem 4, $\mathbf{Y}$ is a renewal process, we can use the Renewal Theorem, stating that $\lim_n\mathbb{P}(Y_n=1)=(\mathbb{E}T_{\mathbf{Y}})^{-1}$, and obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})=\frac{1}{1+\sum_{k\geq1}\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\alpha_i^{\xi_{i+1}}\right]}.$$

□

Proof of Proposition 1. Observe that since $\{0\leftrightarrow n\}\subset\{\xi_n=1\}$, we have using Lemma 1, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})=\lim_n\mathbb{P}(Y_n=1)\leq\lim_n\mathbb{P}(\xi_n=1)$. But when $\mathbb{E}T=\infty$, we know by the Renewal Theorem that $\mathbb{P}(\xi_n=1)$ vanishes as n diverges. □

Proof of Proposition 2. An upper bound for $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})$ follows easily from Theorem 1 and the Jensen inequality, by the convexity of the exponential function,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\alpha_i^{\xi_{i+1}}&=\mathbb{E}e^{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\xi_{i+1}\log\alpha_i}\\&\geq e^{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\mathbb{E}\xi_{i+1}\log\alpha_i}\\&=e^{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i+1}=1)\log\alpha_i}\\&=\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\alpha_i^{\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i+1}=1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})\leq\left(1+\sum_{k\geq0}\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\alpha_i^{\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i+1}=1)}\right)^{-1}\tag{10}$$

and a sufficient condition for a.s. extinction is that $\sum_{k\geq 0}\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\alpha_i^{\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i+1}=1)}=\infty$. The Raabe criterion states, for non-negative real sequences u_k, $k\geq 1$, that if $\limsup k\,(u_k/u_{k+1}-1)<1$, then $\sum_k u_k=\infty$. In our case, it is therefore enough that

$$\limsup\ k\left(\frac{1}{\alpha_k^{\mathbb{P}(\xi_{k+1}=1)}}-1\right)<1.$$

By the Renewal Theorem, $\mathbb{P}(\xi_{k+1}=1)$ converges to $(\mathbb{E}T)^{-1}$. Moreover, α_k increases to 1. Thus, it is enough that

$$\limsup\ k(1-\alpha_k^{(\mathbb{E}T)^{-1}})<1.$$

Using Taylor, for large k, $\alpha_k^{(\mathbb{E}T)^{-1}}=1-(\mathbb{E}T)^{-1}(1-\alpha_k)\,[1-O(1-\alpha_k)]$ and we conclude that a sufficient condition for a.s. extinction is

$$\limsup\ k(\mathbb{E}T)^{-1}(1-\alpha_k)<1.$$

□

Once we get a lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})$, the proof of Proposition 3 follows the same lines as the proof of Proposition 2. The point is that it is much more tricky to get a useful lower bound in general. We now present such a lower bound in Lemma 2, whose proof, rather lengthy, is given in the next subsection.

Recall that

$$C_k:=\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k}\prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1}q_i^*\right)^2, \tag{11}$$

where $q_i^*:=\sup_{n\leq i}q_i$.

Lemma 2.

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})\geq\left(1+\sum_{k\geq 1}\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\alpha_i^{\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i+1}=1)+C_k\log\alpha_i}\right)^{-1}.$$

The proof of this lemma follows essentially the same arguments of the concentration inequalities obtained in Chazottes, Collet, Külske and Redig (2007). However, there as some slight differences which are of substantial importance and make the relation less explicit. Thus instead of just referring to their work and asking the reader to make the relationship between the results in Chazottes et al. (2007) and our lemma, we present a proof in our framework in Section 3.4.

Proof of Proposition 3. We need to prove that the series in the lower bound of Lemma 2 is summable. It will be convenient to write it as follows

$$\sum_{k\geq 1}\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\alpha_i^{\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i+1}=1)+C_k\log\alpha_i}=\sum_{k\geq 1}\left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\alpha_i^{\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i+1}=1)}\right)A_k$$

where

$$A_k=\exp\left(C_k\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}(\log\alpha_i)^2\right).$$

We already know, using the Raabe criterion as before, that $\liminf_{n\to\infty}n(\mathbb{E}T)^{-1}(1-\alpha_n)>1$ (which is the assumption of the proposition) makes $\sum_{k\geq 1}\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\alpha_i^{\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i+1}=1)}$ summable. Thus, it only remains to prove that A_k, $k\geq 1$ is bounded.

If C_k diverges, and we need to control the product $C_k \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\log \alpha_i)^2$ in order to make A_k bounded. Consider any sequence α_n, $n \geq 0$, satisfying $\liminf_{n\to\infty} n(\mathbb{E}T)^{-1}(1-\alpha_n) > 1$ as specified by the corollary. By the definition of $\liminf$, we know that $\alpha_k \leq 1 - \mathbb{E}T/k$ for k sufficiently large. Therefore, it is enough to prove that A_k is bounded for $\alpha_k \sim 1 - \mathbb{E}T/k$. Since, if the rumour survives with positive probability for this linear decaying sequence, by an obvious coupling argument (using $R_i \geq \bar{R}_i$, $i \geq 0$) it survives for any sequence dominated by it. We therefore fix $\alpha_k \sim 1 - \mathbb{E}T/k$, and observe that in this case $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\log \alpha_i)^2 = O(1/k)$. Since $C_k = O(k)$ under (4), the result follows.

□

3.4 Proof of Lemma 2

The proof will be done in three parts. First we explain the martingale difference method used to obtain concentration inequalities. At some point, we will need to estimate the probability of discrepancy between coupled delayed renewal processes, and thus, the second part of the proof is the explicit construction of a coupling of these processes. The proof of the lemma is concluded in a third step.

Notation alert 3.1. *For notational simplicity, we will translate the indexes of one unit along Section 3.4, to study* $\mathbb{E}\prod_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i^{\xi_i}$ *instead of* $\mathbb{E}\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha_i^{\xi_{i+1}}$.

3.4.1 The method of martingale difference

Let $g(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_k) := \sum_{i=1}^{k} \xi_i \log \alpha_i$. We will upper-bound

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \xi_i \log \alpha_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}(\xi_i = 1) \log \alpha_i\right) = \mathbb{E}(e^{g - \mathbb{E}g}). \tag{12}$$

This is a quantity one usually has to upper bound when we want to obtain (exponential) concentration inequalities for the function g of a vector of random variables. A well-known method in the literature of concentration inequalities is that of martingale difference (McDiarmid, 1989, Section 4) that we now explain. Let, for $i = 1, \ldots, k$

$$\Delta_i := \mathbb{E}(g|\mathcal{F}_1^i) - \mathbb{E}(g|\mathcal{F}_1^{i-1}),$$

where $\mathcal{F}_1^0$ is the trivial σ-algebra. These quantities sum telescopically in i to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \Delta_i(\xi_1^i) = g(\xi_1^k) - \mathbb{E}g(\xi_1^k).$$

Since $\mathcal{F}_1^{i-1} \subset \mathcal{F}_1^i$, we have $\mathbb{E}(\Delta_i|\mathcal{F}_1^{i-1}) = 0$ which means that Δ_i, $i \geq 1$ forms a martingale difference sequence. If there exists, for any $i \geq 1$, a finite real number d_i such that $|\Delta_i| \leq d_i$ a.s., we can use the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (Azuma, 1967, proof of Lemma 4.1) which states

$$\mathbb{E}e^{g - \mathbb{E}g} \leq e^{\frac{1}{8}\sum_i d_i^2}. \tag{13}$$

Thus, to obtain our results, it only remains to upper bound $\sum_i d_i^2$ properly. Let us

compute, for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_i(\xi_1^i) &= \sum_{u_{i+1}^k} \mathbb{P}(u_{i+1}^k|\xi_1^i) g(\xi_1^i u_{i+1}^k) - \sum_{u_i^k} \mathbb{P}(u_i^k|\xi_1^{i-1}) g(\xi_1^{i-1} u_i^k) \\ &= \sum_{u_i} \mathbb{P}(u_i|\xi_1^{i-1}) \left(\sum_{u_{i+1}^k} \mathbb{P}(u_{i+1}^k|\xi_1^i) g(\xi_1^i u_{i+1}^k) - \sum_{u_{i+1}^k} \mathbb{P}(u_{i+1}^k|\xi_1^{i-1}u_i) g(\xi_1^{i-1} u_i^k) \right) \\ &\le \left| \sum_{u_{i+1}^k} \mathbb{P}(u_{i+1}^k|\xi_1^{i-1}1) g(\xi_1^{i-1}1 u_{i+1}^k) - \sum_{u_{i+1}^k} \mathbb{P}(u_{i+1}^k|\xi_1^{i-1}0) g(\xi_1^{i-1}0 u_{i+1}^k) \right|\end{aligned}$$

where we used the convention that $\xi_1^0 = \emptyset$. A similar computation yields

$$\Delta_k(\xi_1^k) \le |\log \alpha_k| \,.$$

Let $\mathcal{Q}((\cdot,\cdot)|1\xi_1^{i-1}1, 1\xi_1^{i-1}0)$ denote the law of a coupling between two discrete renewal sequence having the same inter-arrival distribution and starting from the different configurations $1\xi_1^{i-1}1$ and $1\xi_1^{i-1}0$. We obtain for $i = 1, \dots, k-1$

$$\Delta_i(\xi_1^i) \le \sum_{u_{i+1}^k, v_{i+1}^k} \mathcal{Q}(u_{i+1}^k, v_{i+1}^k|1\xi_1^{i-1}1, 1\xi_1^{i-1}0) \; |g(\xi_1^{i-1}1u_{i+1}^k) - g(\xi_1^{i-1}0v_{i+1}^k)|. \tag{14}$$

Now, for $x \in \{0,1\}$, we let $\bar{x}$ denote $1-x$. We have, for $i = 1, \dots, k$

$$\delta_i g := \sup_{x_1,\dots,x_k} |g(x_1, \dots, x_k) - g(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, \bar{x}_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k)| = |\log \alpha_i|. \tag{15}$$

For $i = 1, \dots, k$

$$|g(\xi_1^{i-1}1u_{i+1}^k) - g(\xi_1^{i-1}0v_{i+1}^k)| \le \sum_{j=0}^{k-i} |\log \alpha_{i+j}| \mathbf{1}\{u_{i+j} \ne v_{i+j}\} \tag{16}$$

where we use the notation $u_i = 1$ and $v_i = 0$. We introduce the upper triangular $k \times k$ matrix $D(\xi_1^n)$ defined for $j = 0, \dots, k-i$, by

$$\begin{aligned}D_{i,i+j}(\xi_1^i) &:= \sum_{u_{i+1}^k, v_{i+1}^k} \mathcal{Q}(u_{i+1}^k, v_{i+1}^k|1\xi_1^{i-1}1, 1\xi_1^{i-1}0) \mathbf{1}\{u_{i+j} \ne v_{i+j}\} \\ &= \mathcal{Q}(u_{i+j} \ne v_{i+j}|1\xi_1^{i-1}1, 1\xi_1^{i-1}0).\end{aligned}$$

Notice that this matrix has only 1's on the diagonal since we have by definition, for any i, $D_{i,i}(\xi_1^i) = \mathcal{Q}(u_i \ne v_i|1\xi_1^{i-1}1, 1\xi_1^{i-1}0) = 1$. We obtain using (14), (15) and (16)

$$\Delta_i(\xi_1^i) \le \sum_{j=0}^{k-i} D_{i,i+j}(\xi_1^i) |\log \alpha_{i+j}| = (D(\xi_1^k)L)_i \,, \; i = 1, \dots, k \tag{17}$$

where L is the $k \times 1$ matrix (column vector) with entries $L_{i,1} = |\log \alpha_i|$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. Observe that with this notation, we have $\Delta_k(\xi_1^k) \le |\log \alpha_k|$ as we said in the beginning, since $D_{k,k}(\xi_1^k) = 1$.

We now want to obtain an upper bound for $D_{i,i+j}(\xi_1^i)$, $i \ge 1$, $j = 1, \dots, k-i$ that does not depend on ξ_1^i. Let $\ell(1\xi_1^i)$ denote the smaller integer k such that $\xi_{i-k+1}^i = 0^k$. Observe that $\ell(1\xi_1^i) \le \ell(10^i) = i$ (this is one of the main differences with the case of Chazottes et al. (2007)). Then, for $i \ge 1$, $D_{i,i+j}(\xi_1^i)$ is equal to the probability that two coupled renewal processes, one undelayed (the one starting with $1\xi_1^{i-1}1$), and the other with delay $\ell(1\xi_1^{i-1}0) \ge 1$ (the one starting with $1\xi_1^{i-1}0$), disagree at time j. In order to get an upper bound for this probability of discrepancy, we construct a coupling in next section.

3.4.2 Construction of the coupling

For any $i \geq 0$, let $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(i)}$ denote the renewal sequence with delay of size i. If $i = 0$, then this is the undelayed renewal sequence $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. Recall that $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ was constructed as a coordinate-wise function of the Markov chain $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$, which starts from state 0. Indeed, $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(i)}$ can be obtained in the exact same way, from the Markov chain $\boldsymbol{\zeta}^{(i)}$ with the same transition matrix Q as $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$, but starting from state i.

Now, for any pair of integers $i, j \geq 0$, we will define a coupling $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(i)}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(j)})$ between two renewal processes with the same inter-arrival distribution, one with a delay of size i and the other with a delay of size j. It is, one more time, convenient to define this coupling as a coordinate-wise function of a coupling $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}^{(i)}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}^{(j)})$ between two Markov chains with same transition matrix Q, starting from states i and j respectively.

The coupling $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}^{(i)}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}^{(j)})$ is performed using a single sequence of i.i.d. random variables $(U_i)_{i\geq 1}$ uniformly distributed in $[0, 1[$ (let $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}$ denote the law of this sequence), iteratively as follows: $\left(\tilde{\zeta}_0^{(i)}, \tilde{\zeta}_0^{(j)}\right) = (i, j)$ and for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\left(\tilde{\zeta}_k^{(i)}, \tilde{\zeta}_k^{(j)}\right) = \left((\tilde{\zeta}_{k-1}^{(i)} + 1)\mathbf{1}\left\{U_k \leq q_{\tilde{\zeta}_{k-1}^{(i)}}\right\}, (\tilde{\zeta}_{k-1}^{(j)} + 1)\mathbf{1}\left\{U_k \leq q_{\tilde{\zeta}_{k-1}^{(j)}}\right\}\right).$$

Then, we naturally obtain $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(i)}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(j)})$ by defining for any $k \geq 0$

$$\left(\tilde{\xi}_k^{(i)}, \tilde{\xi}_k^{(j)}\right) = \left(\mathbf{1}\{\tilde{\zeta}_k^{(i)} = 0\}, \mathbf{1}\{\tilde{\zeta}_k^{(j)} = 0\}\right).$$

Based on this coupling, we now define the random variable

$$\tau_{i,j} = \inf\{l \geq 1 : \tilde{\xi}_l^{(i)} = \tilde{\xi}_l^{(j)} = 1\}$$

which happens to be equal to

$$\inf\{l \geq 1 : \tilde{\zeta}_l^{(i)} = \tilde{\zeta}_l^{(j)} = 0\}.$$

3.4.3 Conclusion of the proof of the Lemma

Using now the coupling constructed in Section 3.4.2, we have the upper bound,

$$D_{i,i+j}(\xi_1^i) = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}\left(\tilde{\xi}_j^{(0)} \neq \tilde{\xi}_j^{(\ell(\xi_1^i))}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(\tau_{0,\ell(\xi_1^i)} \geq j).$$

If we want this to be independent of ξ_1^i, we take the supremum over all the possible values of $\ell(\xi_1^i)$: for any $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $j = 1, \ldots, k - i$

$$D_{i,i+j}(\xi_1^i) \leq \sup_{\ell=1,\ldots,i} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(\tau_{0,\ell} \geq j).$$

For further calculations, it will also be easier if we have an upper bound that does not depend on i, then we take

$$D_{i,i+j}(\xi_1^i) \leq \sup_{\ell=1,\ldots,k} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(\tau_{0,\ell} \geq j) =: \bar{D}_{i,i+j}.$$

In view of (13), we now take

$$d_i := (\bar{D}L)_i$$

and thus, by well known norm inequalities,

$$\sum_i d_i^2 \leq \|\bar{D}L\|_2^2 \leq \|\bar{D}\|_2^2 \|L\|_2^2 \leq \|\bar{D}\|_1 \|\bar{D}\|_\infty \|L\|_2^2.$$

In the present case,

$$\|\bar{D}\|_1 = \|\bar{D}\|_\infty = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \max_{\ell=1,\dots,k} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(\tau_{0,\ell} \geq j)$$

and thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i^2 \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \max_{\ell=1,\dots,k} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(\tau_{0,\ell} \geq j) \right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^{k} (\log \alpha_i)^2.$$

Recalling that we translated the indexes in the beginning of the proof, what we proved, from (13), is that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(e^{\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \xi_i \log \alpha_i - \mathbb{E}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \xi_i \log \alpha_i} \right) \leq e^{\frac{1}{8}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \max_{\ell=1,\dots,k} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(\tau_{0,\ell} \geq j)\right)^2 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\log \alpha_i)^2}$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha_i^{\xi_i} \leq \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha_i^{\mathbb{P}(\xi_i = 1)} \exp\left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \max_{\ell=1,\dots,k} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(\tau_{0,\ell} \geq j) \right)^2 \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (\log \alpha_i)^2 \right). \tag{18}$$

To conclude the statement of the lemma, it only remains to prove that

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \max_{\ell=1,\dots,k} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(\tau_{0,\ell} \geq j) \right)^2 \leq C_k := \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1} q_i^\star \right)^2$$

where we recall that $q_i^\star := \sup_{n \leq i} q_n$. First observe that for any $\ell \in \{0, \dots, k\}$,

$$\tau_{0,\ell} := \inf\{l \geq 1 : \tilde{\xi}_l^{(0)} = \tilde{\xi}_l^{(\ell)} = 1\} \leq \inf\{l \geq 1 : \tilde{\xi}_l^{(i)} = 1\,, i = 0, \dots, k\} := T_k.$$

Here, the formal definition of T_k involves the coupling of $k+1$ renewal processes instead of only two as we introduced in Section 3.4.2. However the extension of this coupling to any finite (or even infinite) number of renewal processes is straightforward. Thus, $\max_{\ell=1,\dots,k} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(\tau_{0,\ell} \geq j) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(T_k \geq j)$. We now conclude observing that our coupling is such that

$$\{T_k \geq j\} \subset \cap_{i=1}^{j-1} \{U_i \leq q_{k+i-1}^\star\},$$

since if $U_i \geq q_{k+i-1}^\star$ for some $i = 1, \dots, j-1$, then $U_i \geq q_{\xi_{i-1}^{(n)}}$ for $n = 0, \dots, k$, and therefore $\xi_i^{(n)} = 1$ for $n = 0, \dots, k$ (all the renewal processes merge at time $i < j$).

4 Discussion, interpretations and related models

Explicit cases that fit into condition (4). As promised, we now prove that the two examples mentioned right after Proposition 3 fit into condition (4).

(i) **Doeblin assumption:** $q_i \leq 1 - \epsilon$ for $i \geq 0$ and therefore

$$C_k = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1} q_i^\star \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} (1-\epsilon)^j \right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{1-\epsilon}{\epsilon} \right)^2 = O(k).$$

(ii) **Doeblin for large i's:** Coming back to the proof of Lemma 2, we see that it was enough to prove that $\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(T_k \geq j)\right)^2 = O(k)$ instead of proving the same for $\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1} q_i^\star\right)^2$. And it turns out that this under the weaker condition that $1 - q_i \geq \epsilon$ for any sufficiently large i's. Let us use the notation

$$i^\star := \min\{i \geq 0 : 1 - q_j \geq \epsilon,\, j \geq i\}.$$

Indeed, if $i^\star$ is finite, we have $\alpha := \inf_{i \geq 0} Q^{i^\star+1}(i, 0) > 0$. This means that we can couple the $k+1$ Markov chain in such a way that each $i^\star + 1$ steps, every coupled markov chains have a positive probability, at least α, to merge at 0. Thus

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(T_k \geq j)\right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{j \geq 1} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{U}}(T_k \geq j)\right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{k \geq 1} (i^\star + 1)(1 - \alpha)^{k-1}\right)^2 < \infty.$$

(iii) **Monotone case:** q_i's are monotonically increasing and therefore

$$C_k = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1} q_i\right)^2.$$

Let us show that the polynomial case $q_i = 1 - \frac{1}{i^\beta}$, $0 < \beta < 1/2$, $i \geq 2$, fits into condition (4). Let us compute

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{i^\beta}\right) &\leq \exp\left(-\sum_{i=k}^{k+j-1} \frac{1}{i^\beta}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\int_{i=k}^{k+j} \frac{1}{x^\beta} dx\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{1-\beta}[(k+j)^{1-\beta} - k^{1-\beta}]\right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1} q_i\right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{j \geq 1} \exp\left[-C\left((j+k)^{1-\beta} - k^{1-\beta}\right)\right]\right)^2.$$

After some simple calculations, we get

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1} q_i\right)^2 \leq \left(e^{\frac{k^{1-\beta}}{1-\beta}} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{1-\beta}, \frac{k^{1-\beta}}{1-\beta}\right)\right)^2$$

where $\Gamma(s, x) := \int_x^\infty t^{s-1} e^{-t} dt$. It is well-known that $\Gamma(s, x) x^{1-s} e^x \to 1$ as $x \to \infty$. Thus, in our case, using $C_\beta := (1-\beta)^{2\beta/(1-\beta)}$, we have, as we said above,

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1} q_i\right)^2 C_\beta k^{-2\beta} \to 1,\, k \to \infty.$$

Thus, since $\beta < 1/2$, we have in particular that $\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1} q_i\right)^2 = O(k)$.

Firework processes. As mentioned earlier, our percolation model is an extension of the firework model introduced in Junior et al. (2011) while the dual of our percolation model is an extension of the reverse firework process. We now take some time to consider more carefully this later process that we call the renewal reverse firework process. Let us just point that in both works, Junior et al. (2011) (case where $\xi_k = 1$ for all $k \geq 1$) and Gallo et al. (2014) (case where $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is an i.i.d. sequence), the necessary and sufficient condition for survival of the reverse firework process is that $\prod_{k\geq 0} \alpha_k = 0$, or equivalently, $\sum_{k\geq 0}(1-\alpha_k) = \infty$. We will show that the same occurs in the present case. This is a corollary of Theorem 4.

Corollary 2. *The renewal reverse firework process survives if and only if* $\prod_{k\geq 0} \alpha_k = 0$.

Proof. Theorem 4 states that the dual process is itself a renewal process with inter-arrival distribution

$$\mathbb{E}(1-\alpha_{k-1}^{\xi_k}) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_{i-1}^{\xi_i}\,,\ k \geq 2.$$

As a direct consequence, there will be infinitely many 1's in this process (meaning that it survives) if, and only if, it is recurrent, that is, if, and only if,

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{i\geq 0} \alpha_i^{\xi_{i+1}} = 0.$$

Now, let $\mathcal{T}_0 := 0$ and for any $i \geq 1$, $\mathcal{T}_i$ denotes the time of the i^{th} occurrence of a 1 (starting the count from time 1) in the renewal process,

$$\mathcal{T}_i := \inf\{j \geq \mathcal{T}_{i-1} + 1 : \xi_j = 1\}.$$

The variables $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 - \mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_i - \mathcal{T}_{i-1} \ldots$ are i.i.d.. Observe that

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{i\geq 0} \alpha_i^{\xi_{i+1}} = \mathbb{E} \prod_{i\geq 0} \alpha_{\mathcal{T}_{i+1}}.$$

The sequence α_k can be viewed as a non-decreasing function $R(k)$, and we can therefore use Theorem 3(iii) in Puri (1978) which states that

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{i\geq 0} \alpha_{\mathcal{T}_{i+1}} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k\geq 0}(1-\alpha_k) = \infty.$$

We conclude that the renewal reverse firework process survives if and only if this later condition holds. □

Theorem 3 in Gallo et al. (2014) gives much more informations concerning the reverse firework process (central limit theorem for instance). We do not enter these considerations here, but mention that since these properties follow directly from the fact that the FP is a renewal process, they are all inherited by the reverse firework process since Theorem 4 states that the RFP is also a renewal process.

Explicit lower and upper bounds for the probability of percolation. So far, we only cared about getting sufficient conditions for percolation or not. We now try to get explicit bounds for the probability of percolation. Notice that in the above proofs, we easily arrived at the following upper bound

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \left(1 + \sum_{k\geq 1} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \alpha_i^{\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i+1}=1)}\right)^{-1}$$

while Lemma 2 states that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) \geq \left(1 + \sum_{k\geq 1} \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha_i^{\mathbb{P}(\xi_{i+1}=1)+C_k(\log \alpha_i)^2}\right)^{-1}$$

where

$$C_k := \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \prod_{i=k}^{k+j-1} q_i^\star\right)^2. \tag{19}$$

So explicit bounds rely on the ability to obtain explicit bounds on C_k and $\mathbb{P}(\xi_i = 1)$. These are easy to obtain in the Markov case (the case in which $q_l = q_1$ for all $l \geq 1$) for instance, where it is well-known that (denoting $\epsilon := \min\{q_0, q_1, 1-q_0, 1-q_1\}$)

$$C_k \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k} (1-\epsilon)^j\right)^2 = \left((1-\epsilon)\frac{1-(1-\epsilon)^k}{\epsilon}\right)^2$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi_i = 1) = \frac{1}{1-q_1+q_0}\left(q_0 + (1-q_1)(q_1-q_0)^{i+1}\right).$$

In the general non-Markovian case, several bounds can be found in the literature for the renewal probability $\mathbb{P}(\xi_i = 1)$, but we do not pursue here these considerations.

To conclude, let us only mention that in the case where the q_i's are monotonically increasing, the measure of the renewal process has the "monotonicity" property (see e.g. (Georgii, Häggström and Maes, 2001)) allowing to use the FKG inequality $\mathbb{E}\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha_i^{\xi_{i+1}} \geq \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}\alpha_i^{\xi_{i+1}}$. Thus

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \left(1 + \sum_{n\geq 1} \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} [1 - \mathbb{P}(\xi_{i+1} = 1)(1-\alpha_i)]\right)^{-1}.$$

This upper bound is tight because we know that the i.i.d. case satisfies the monotonicity condition and by Corollary 1 it reaches this upper bound.

References

Athreya, S., Roy, R. and Sarkar, A. (2004). On the coverage of space by random sets, *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **36**(1): 1–18.

Azuma, K. (1967). Weighted sums of certain dependent random variables, *Tôhoku Math. J. (2)* **19**: 357–367.

Bertacchi, D. and Zucca, F. (2013). Rumor processes in random environment on $\mathbb{N}$ and galton-watson trees, *J. Stat. Phys.* **153**(3): 486–511.

Chazottes, J.-R., Collet, P., Külske, C. and Redig, F. (2007). Concentration inequalities for random fields via coupling, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **137**(1-2): 201–225.

Gallo, S., Garcia, Nancy, L., Junior, V. V. and Rodríguez, P. M. (2014). Rumor processes on n and discrete renewal processes, *J. Stat. Phys.* **155**(3): 591–602.

Georgii, H.-O., Häggström, O. and Maes, C. (2001). The random geometry of equilibrium phases, *Phase transitions and critical phenomena, Vol. 18*, Vol. 18 of *Phase Transit. Crit. Phenom.*, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, pp. 1–142.

Junior, V. V., Machado, F. P. and Zuluaga, M. (2011). Rumor processes on $\mathbb{N}$, *J. Appl. Probab.* **48**(3): 624–636.

Kolev, N., Kolkovska, E. T. and López-Mimbela, J. A. (2006). Joint probability generating function for a vector of arbitrary indicator variables, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **186**(1): 89–98.
URL: *http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2005.03.066*

McDiarmid, C. (1989). On the method of bounded differences, *Surveys in combinatorics, 1989 (Norwich, 1989)*, Vol. 141 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, pp. 148–188.

Puri, P. S. (1978). A limit theorem for point processes with applications, *J. Appl. Probab.* **15**(4): 726–747.